Thomas R. Tyrrell
209 South 4th Street
Fulton New York
13069
www.ulsterhistory.com

LINDEN AVENUE CASE.

PROPERTY-OWNERS GIVEN A HEARING BY THE TOWN COUNCIL.

A Large Attendance at the Meeting and Serious Allegations Made—The Question of Grading an Important Factor in the Case—Engineer Olmsted Explains.

The Town Council gave a hearing Wednesday night to the Linden Avenue property-owners in the matter of assessments for improvements made along that street in compliance with a petition submitted to the Council two years ago. There was a large attendance of Linden Avenue people at the meeting.

Seymour P. Gilbert, Clerk of the Board of Assessors, was called on by the Council to assist at the hearing, and read off the name of each property-owner, and in cases where requested the amount of the assessment and what it represented. Among those who personally objected to the assessment levied were Charles Harrington, H. B. Adams, W. H. Swain, Charles Hedden, John Schwab, Gustav Bruett, John T. Baillard, E. K. Schuyler, Mrs. W. A. Francis, Howard M. Van Tassell, R. T. Cadmus and William Rieden.

The objections in particular were of a varied character, some relating to curbs, some to cobble gutters, some to flag walks, some to the number of trees removed, and the majority of them to the matter of grading. Charles V. Powers appeared to be the chief spokesman for the objectors, and he took up the case on broader lines than that of particular objections and his criticisms were of a general character, and he openly declared that the amount of work charged for and certified to by the Town Engineer had not been done, and he based his declarations on information obtained from Clerk Gilbert of the Board of Assessors and from a personal inspection of the street.

Mr. Powers told of the meeting of the property-owners with the Clerk of the Board of Assessors. Mr. Powers first spoke of the grading and said that there had been no grading done in front of his property or that of the people he represented, but according to the facts given him by the Clerk of the Board of Assessors 1095 cubic yards of grading had been certified to by the engineer as having been done and paid for in the street. "After an inspection of the grading by myself and other property-owners in the street," said Mr. Powers, "we were unable to find anything like the amount given us by the Clerk."

"Allowing the sidewalks to be ten feet wide," said Mr. Powers, "and the street 1100 feet long, and providing for a grade of one foot the entire length of the street on both sides, would only give us 22,000 cubic feet or 815 cubic yards. The amount charged (1095 yards) would allow of a good one and one-third feet in depth and ten feet wide the entire length of both sidewalks. In the block between Glenwood Avenue and Thomas Street, 450 feet in length, there was absolutely no grading whatever. On the next block between Thomas Street and Ashland Avenue there was a fill of about 250 feet in length and another fill in front of the Strauss property of about 100 feet in length, and these two fills would not average over twelve inches in depth. There was a cut of about one hundred feet in length in front of Mr. Schaupp's property of less than two feet in depth, and on the next block west of Ashland Avenue a cut of 175 feet in length and of less than two feet in depth in front of the Robert Kay and Building and Loan Association properties. Estimating on the most liberal basis the amount of grading visible, we could not find over 9000 cubic feet, or 333 cubic yards, while we were charged for 1095 yards."

Mr. Powers next took up the matter of trees removed. "From the Clerk of the Board of Assessors we learned," Mr. Powers said, "that the town had paid for the removal of eighteen trees at five dollars each. After careful inquiry of the property-owners from in front of whose property it was stated that trees had been removed, we were only able to account for ten trees, two of which the property-owners told us had been removed gratuitously by people who wanted the wood and not by the contractors.

The flagging of the street corners, while not being assessed to the property-owners of Linden Avenue, but to the township-at-large and the cost of which we do not object to as petitioners, said Mr. Powers, but do object to as town taxpayers was next taken up.

At the corner of Linden and Glenwood Avenues we were shown by the clerk of the Board of Assessors, said Mr. Powers, the amounts of square feet of flagging, sidewalk and square yards of cobble stone gutters charged in the bill, which amounts we were unable to find in cobble stone gutters or in flagging. For example, the corner of Glenwood Avenue in front of the Harrington property, there was only three flags laid or about 32 square feet for which 100 square feet was charged on the opposite corner of the same street about sixty square feet of flagging was laid, for which 100 feet was charged. On other corners where cobble gutters was charged for enough to return around all corners to property line, none was found beyond the Linden Avenue front line making about double the amount charged as found to exist.

Fourteen round corners of curbing was in the bill the clerk of the Board of Assessors told us. We were only able to find thirteen. I was informed, said Mr. Powers, by the clerk of the Board of Assessors, that after allowing for these full amounts of cobble stone gutters charged to street corners, there still had been paid for in the bill 190 lineal feet of cobble gutters four feet wide or 760 square feet, which the Board of Assessors had been unable to locate anywhere in the improvements, and that there had been charged in the bill 32 lineal feet of four feet wide flagwalk, and a new cobble stone gutter of fifty lineal feet in front of the estate of John P. Scherff which the Board had found previously to exist, and which had been charged to the town-at-large. All of these extra amounts, said Mr. Powers, with one third of the amount of the grading and the interest on the cost of the whole improvement caused by the delay, all of which are charged against the town at-large, added to the property-owners high assessment for grading, make a bill of about fifty cents per foot or enough to flag both sides of Linden Avenue with a four-foot pavement its entire length.

Mr. Powers said that his interest in this Linden Avenue matter was more than that of an objecting property-owner. He had assisted Mr. Schuyler in securing signatures to the petition for the improvements, and he was influenced largely by the fact that he thought that it would lead to the adoption of the same kind of improvements in other streets and would prove a good thing for the town. He with others was disappointed in the outcome of the undertaking, and feared that it would have a tendency to discourage improvements.

After the property-owners had been given opportunity to state their case the following letter from Engineer Olmsted to the Council was read by the Clerk:

GENTLEMEN: I was notified by the Town Clerk, Mr. Johnson, of a meeting in the matter of the Linden Avenue improvement which is to take place on Wednesday evening, June 10, and at which I am requested to be present.

I find that it is impossible for me to be there on Wednesday evening, because of very urgent matters which I have on hand, and if I should leave at this time it would entail very serious inconvenience to other parties as well as considerable financial loss. I therefore will make a statement in regard to the matter which I think will be equally as good as my being present.

In the matter of the improvements the petition did not set forth specifically, as it should, the manner in which the assessments were to be made, or how the improvements were to be charged up against the property-owners. I had no way of ascertaining at the time the improvements were taking place how the assessments were to be made, but taking the petition as a guide I had to decide upon some method of procedure. As I was familiar with the method of improvements that had been made about the town, the cobble gutters were laid and paid for out of the town fund at the general town expense, the sidewalks were paid for one-half by property-owners and the other half by the town. In the matter of curbing that was paid for by individuals. It never occurred to me that the property-owners were to be entitled to a rebate because of the conditions as they were found in the street when the improvements were being made. I judged this from the reason as above stated, and also from the language of the petition, as I had no one to counsel with that knew any different. I acted upon that principle, which I judged was the correct one, and am still of the same opinion, although I do not want to be understood as criticising the assessors or the committee or any one else. I had to act upon my own judgment at the time, and if I was in error, it is too late to rectify it now. Acting upon that principle I measured up the different classes of work without any regard to property lines or ownership.

Long after the work was completed it was decided that another method would be adopted, and I was called upon to report what was done for each individual owner along the street. As some time had elapsed I found it was impossible to ascertain exactly what was done at each individual property, but I am satisfied that the measurements as a whole which I have given the Assessors are right.

The small deficiency in the amount, as to the new flag walk, I was unable to positively locate. Wherever flag work was done and a broken stone was found it was replaced by a new stone. Those would be difficult to pick out at this time.

As to the matter of curbing that was very easily defined, as there was very little laid except that which was continuous, and it was easily ascertained. I did the same with the curbing. Where I found a curb stone that did not comply with the specifications I took it out and replaced it with a new stone. This was done in every instance.

The cobble all had to be relaid and a great deal of new work was done. Con-

Continued on page 2.

Industrial Development.

Ground was broken Monday for the first of a series of new factory buildings planned by the Hudson Rolling Mill Company. The factory building will be of brick and 105 feet long and 45 feet wide, one story high, and is located along the line of the Lackawanna Railroad opposite the American Brake Shoe Company's works.

The Hudson Rolling Mill Company owns a tract of ground along Glenwood Avenue from the Lackawanna Company's line south across Tony's Brook to the property on which Loppacker's machine shop is located. The frontage on Glenwood Avenue is 284 feet and about the same number of feet along the line of the railroad. The product of the plant will be cold rolled copper, and the factory will be equipped with the latest approved machinery for that class of work. The officials of the Hudson Rolling Mill Company are, W. S. Benson, President; H. B. Martin of Brooklyn, First Vice-President; James Curren, Second Vice-President; Peter J. Quinn, Secretary and Treasurer.

In connection with the purchase of land along the south side of the Lackawanna Railroad by the Hudson Rolling Mill Company another real estate transaction of much importance to the industrial interests of the town has been made and comprises land adjoining the rolling mill company's land to the south along the railroad, and extends to a line about ten feet beyond that stream crossed under the railroad. It also extends westerly to a line a few feet west of Tony's Brook, and giving the purchasers control of that stream. A right-of-way to Glenwood Avenue has also been purchased along the line of the town's right-of-way for a sewer across the Watsessing Lake property. The purchasers have in view the utilization of the land they have bought for factory purposes, and now have applications under consideration from several parties who are desirous of getting a factory site along a railroad and not too far distant from New York.

SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1903.

Looking to Mr. Moore.

Official hearings in which aggrieved property-owners on one hand, and municipal officials who have tried to please the property-owners on the other hand, get together and endeavor to arrive at a mutual understanding of certain vexatious points of difference in the equitableness or justice of a matter of assessment are not as a rule characterized by harmony and good feeling. Sometimes it is an aggrieved property-owner, who under the excitement of the moment, gives way to his temper and denounces municipal officials and methods in general. At other times a faithful official is stung to anger by the insinuations of a mistaken and misjudging constituency.

At the hearing Wednesday night given by the Town Council to the Linden Avenue property-owners, there was a remarkable absence of any disposition to find undue fault or any indulgence in unnecessary criticism or insinuations of an unpleasant character. The meeting was orderly. All present appeared to be only concerned about the facts in the case, and the property-owners all seemed desirous of paying all just claims against their property. Chairman Peterson and all his colleagues in the Council treated the property-owners with the most respectful consideration, and the property-owners on their part stated their case in a quiet and respectful way.

The action of the Council in referring the case to Councilman Moore for investigation, apparently met with the approbation of the property-owners, and they have that confidence in Mr. Moore that leads them to believe that he will make a speedy, impartial and fearless investigation, and if errors have been made the people will know how they were made and who was responsible for them, and the responsible party or parties will be brought to a strict account. Mr. Moore's attitude in the past on all public questions gives strength to the conviction that the confidence imposed in him by the Linden Avenue property-owners will be amply justified in the findings he will report in the investigation that he is about to undertake.

The Water Question.

While nothing official has been heard from the committee of fifteen appointed to investigate the water supply question, it has been rumored on the street that the committee had succeeded in securing a long extension of the present water contract. Some say the extension is for a year, while others say it is two years at the least.

It is also rumored that the majority sentiment of the committee is in favor of the purchase of the water mains and has obtained an option at a much lower figure than $150,000. Members of the committee who have been spoken to about these various rumors decline either to affirm or deny them.

In connection with the rumors about the work of the committee of Fifteen, the Eagle Rock Water Company is also a subject of interest in connection with the water supply question. It has been stated during the past week that the Rand Drill Company, one of the largest concerns in the country, has expressed its readiness to make a contract with the Eagle Rock Company to construct a pumping plant on the company's land, and guarantee a daily supply of 2,000,000 gallons of water for an indefinite period.

TOWN OF BLOOMFIELD.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON APPLICATION FOR LICENSE.

To Whom It May Concern:

Notice is hereby given that the following applications have been made to the Council of the Town of Bloomfield in the County of Essex, to wit:

FIRST WARD.

GEORGE B. TUCKER, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. 15 Broad Street, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Wm. R. Rawson and Edward H. Becker.

ARTHUR LEUTHAUSSER, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. 699 Bloomfield Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Fred G. Fleischer and Solomon Harris.

WM. J. RAAB, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. 425 Bloomfield Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Wm. R. Raab and Joseph Buck.

HENRY TREIBER, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. 185 Bloomfield Avenue in said town.

Names of bondsmen: John Charles and Nicholas Schneider.

ERNEST GRAVELLE, for a license to keep an inn and tavern corner of Washington and Bloomfield Avenues in said town.

Names of bondsmen: James Mulligan and Thomas [illegible].

FRANK WALECKI, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] John Street in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Michael Jeane and Karl Betzel.

JOHN [illegible], for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Street in said town.

Names of bondsmen: [illegible] Mayer and Wahrenberger.

[illegible] for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Bloomfield Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: [illegible] and Frank H. [illegible].

SECOND WARD.

ISRAEL LEHMAN, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Street, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Max Heyer, Emil [illegible] Miller.

THOMAS A. HALLINAN, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. 58 Broad Street, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Charles J. Hallinan and Mary A. Boyce.

WM. E. COURTER, for a license to keep an inn and tavern, corner of Broad Street and Watchung Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Richards K. Schuyler and Thomas A. Hallinan.

STACKWELL EVESKY, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Lock Street, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: James A. Murphy and Frank E. [illegible].

CONSTANTE ZELIKOWSKY, for a license to keep a saloon at No. [illegible] Myrtle Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: W. C. Fredericks and Theodore [illegible].

THIRD WARD.

JOHN KOBLE, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Bloomfield Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: [illegible] Scruggs and M. J. [illegible].

NICHOLAS KOBLE, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Glenwood Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Charles J. Hallinan and [illegible].

J. GILBERT [illegible], for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Bloomfield Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: John Lauretz and Thomas M. Carlin.

HARRY SNYDER and MORRIS SNYDER, doing business under the firm name of H. Snyder & Son, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. 230 Glenwood Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Fred C. Krueger and Emily Upton.

WILLIAM JOHNSON, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Glenwood Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Frank S. Conquest and Richard J. Maxwell.

ELIZABETH METZ, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Bloomfield Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Louis Schlopff and Theodore Allendorf.

ALFRED JOHNSON, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Street, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: [illegible] and F. H. [illegible].

WM. [illegible], for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Street, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: [illegible] Smith and Jos. [illegible].

ALOIS PETELINE, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Street, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Charles Handschuher and Albert Schmidt.

WM. ASHWORTH, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Street, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: James V. Nicoll and Wm. Parrish.

MARGARET STEWART, for a license to keep an inn and tavern at No. [illegible] Glenwood Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Wm. Cunningham and Arthur [illegible].

NICHOLAS DEEGAN, for a license to keep a saloon at No. [illegible] and a storage in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Neale Hampson and John W. Gorsuch.

THEODORE STEENWERTH, for a license to keep a saloon at No. [illegible] Glenwood Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: James Mahoney and A. Ricard [illegible].

MOSES SCHEUER and DAVID SCHEUER, doing business under the firm name of Scheuer & Bro., for a license to keep a wholesale liquor store at No. [illegible] Bloomfield Avenue, in said town.

Names of bondsmen: Solomon Schwarzbaum and John [illegible].

And that the Board has designated MONDAY, the 22nd day of June, 1903, at 8 o'clock P. M., at the Council Chamber, National Bank Building, Broad Street, as the time for hearing all objections that may be made to the granting of said applications.

Dated BLOOMFIELD, N. J., June 2, 1903.

WM. L. JOHNSON,
Town Clerk.

ORDINANCE.

An ordinance appropriating and providing for raising by taxation moneys for public purposes for the year nineteen hundred and three.

The Council of the Town of Bloomfield, in the County of Essex, do ordain as follows:

There shall be assessed, raised by taxation, and collected for the year nineteen hundred and three, upon the personal property, and from all persons residing in and upon all lands and real estate located within the Town of Bloomfield, in the County of Essex, and the State of New Jersey, the following sums of money for the purposes hereinafter expressed, to wit:

1. For lighting the streets of the town	$10,000 00
2. For the support of the Police Department	5,800 00
3. For the maintenance of the Fire Department	3,500 00
4. For regulating, cleaning and keeping in repair streets and highways	10,000 00
5. For the relief of the poor	3,000 00
6. For water for the extinguishment of fires	7,500 00
7. For the payment of interest upon the debt of the Town and such part of the principal as shall from time to time become due and payable	21,000 00
8. For the general and incidental expenses of the town, including the printing and publication of the minutes of Council and ordinances, and such other matters required by law to be published	13,000 00
9. For the support of the public schools	37,500 00
	$111,300 00

Ordinance adopted June 1, 1903.

GEORGE PETERSON,
Chairman Town Council.

Attest:
WM. L. JOHNSON,
Town Clerk.

NOTICE.

The Board of Assessors will be in session on June 6, 13 and 20, 1903, between the hours of 9 and 12 o'clock A. M., at their room, Bloomfield National Bank Building, Broad Street, third floor, to hear any interested in the assessments for real and personal property for the year 1903.

SEYMOUR P. GILBERT,
Clerk Board of Assessors.

BLOOMFIELD, May 29, 1903.

[illegible] of the convention the party will spend some time in sightseeing on the Pacific coast, and will probably reach home in about two months.

Excavating orders promptly tended to at reasonable rates. Apply to or address RICHARD MAXWELL, No. 25 Clinton Street, Bloomfield.—Adv.

[illegible] subject of an address by Rev. Charles A. Cook. The people present sang "The Red, White and Blue," "Star Spangled Banner," and "Rally 'Round the Flag."